



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20411
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09 893,554	06 29 2001	Suk Min Son	041501-5435	5079

9629 7590 02 21 2003

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

LEURIG, SHARLENE L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2879

DATE MAILED: 02/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/893,554

Applicant(s)

SON, SUK MIN

Examiner

Sharlene Leurig

Art Unit

2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 January 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application)
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other.

Art Unit: 2879

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-11 in Paper No. 4 is acknowledged.

Priority

2. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in Korea on December 22, 2000. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the Korean application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 5 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita et al. (5,831,374) in view of admitted prior art (admission). Morita discloses a flat luminescent lamp comprising a first substrate (Figure 1, element 1b) having a first surface and a second surface, a second substrate (1a) having a first surface disposed facing opposite to the first surface of the first substrate, and a plurality of grooves (21) formed on the second surface of the first substrate. The grooved unit and the second substrate may be in direct contact with each other, and therefore the

Art Unit: 2879

plurality of grooves is formed on the second surface of the first substrate (column 7, line 40).

Regarding claim 2, the grooves are formed as a matrix unit with the first substrate. The discharge cells of the display panel are formed in a matrix array (column 3, lines 31-32) and the grooved unit is formed in a matrix pattern on the back surface of the display panel (column 5, lines 50-52).

Morita lacks disclosure of luminescent layers in the display. However, it is well known in the art to provide luminescent layers for display devices in order to create luminescent displays.

The applicant's admission of the prior art teaches a first and a second luminescent layer on opposing sides of the first and second substrates (Figure 2, elements 15 and 15a). Therefore regarding claim 1, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Morita's display with two luminescent layers on opposing sides of the first and second substrates in order to provide a luminescent display device.

Regarding claim 3, Morita lacks disclosure of luminescent layers formed on first and second electrodes but does disclose multiple electrodes that produce discharge in the discharge cells (column 4, line 59).

The applicant's admission of the prior art teaches a first and a second electrode (13 and 13a) having luminescent layers (15 and 15a) formed on them. Therefore regarding claim 3, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

Art Unit: 2879

time of the invention to modify Morita's display with two luminescent layers on opposing electrodes in order to provide a luminescent display device.

Regarding claim 5, Morita discloses a flat luminescent lamp comprising a first substrate (Figure 1, element 1b) having a first surface and a second surface, a second substrate (1a) having a first surface disposed facing opposite to the first surface of the first substrate, and a plurality of grooves (21) formed on the second surface of the first substrate. The grooved unit and the second substrate may be in direct contact with each other, and therefore the plurality of grooves is formed on the second surface of the first substrate (column 7, line 40).

Morita lacks explicit disclosure of electrodes formed on opposing surfaces of the first and second substrates but does disclose multiple electrodes that produce discharge in the discharge cells (column 4, line 59). Furthermore, Morita lacks disclosure of luminescent layers in the display. However, it is well known in the art to provide luminescent layers for display devices in order to create luminescent displays.

The applicant's admission of the prior art teaches a first and a second electrode (13 and 13a) having luminescent layers (15 and 15a) formed on them. Therefore regarding claim 5, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Morita's display with two luminescent layers on opposing electrodes in order to provide a luminescent display device.

Morita also lacks disclosure of a plurality of frame portions formed on the first surface of the first substrate and the first surface of the second substrate to seal the first

Art Unit: 2879

substrate and the second substrate. However, it is well known in the art to seal the two substrates together by forming frames or spacers.

The applicant's admission of the prior art teaches the formation of a plurality of frame portions (Figure 2, elements 19a and 19b) in order to seal the first and second substrates. Therefore regarding claim 5, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Morita's display with a plurality of frame portions in order to seal the substrates together and provide stability to the substrate structure.

Regarding claim 9, Morita discloses a flat luminescent lamp comprising a first substrate (Figure 1, element 1b) and a second substrate (1a).

Morita lacks explicit disclosure of electrodes formed on opposing surfaces of the first and second substrates but does disclose multiple electrodes that produce discharge in the discharge cells (column 4, line 59). Morita further lacks disclosure of dielectric layers formed on the electrodes.

However, the use of dielectric layers formed on electrodes is well known in the art.

The applicant's admission of the prior art teaches the formation of two dielectric layers, one on each substrate formed over the electrodes (Figure 2, elements 12 and 12a). Therefore regarding claim 9, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Morita's display with dielectric layers formed over the electrodes on both substrates in order to insulate and secure the electrodes.

Art Unit: 2879

Regarding claim 10, Morita lacks a reflective layer formed on the first dielectric layer.

However, as admitted by the applicant, it is well known in the art to provide reflective layers to prevent the generated light from leaking toward a back surface of the lower plate.

The applicant's admission of the prior art teaches the formation of a reflective layer (Figure 2, element 14) on the first dielectric. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Morita's lamp with a reflective layer over the first dielectric layer to prevent leakage of the generated light toward the back surface of the display and therefore provide a more efficient lamp.

5. Claims 4, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita et al. (5,831,374) in view of admitted prior art (admission) as applied to claims 1-3, 5 and 9-10 above, and further in view of Sreeram et al. (6,140,759). Morita discloses a flat luminescent lamp comprising a first substrate (Figure 1, element 1b) having a first surface and a second surface and a second substrate (1a) having a first surface disposed facing opposite to the first surface of the first substrate, both substrates being made of glass (column 4, line 56) but lacks a first substrate made of metal or ceramic.

However, it is well known in the art to improve the picture quality and processing of displays.

Sreeram teaches the use of a metal backplate (first substrate) in order to improve the processing of the plasma display panel (column 3, lines 59-62). Therefore regarding

Art Unit: 2879

claims 4 and 6, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Morita's display with a first substrate made of metal in order to improve the processing of the display panel.

Regarding claim 7, Morita discloses a flat luminescent lamp with a first substrate including a first flat layer of a fixed area (Figure 4, element 1) but lacks a second layer that is a matrix. Morita does disclose a plurality of discharge cells.

However, it is well known in the art to provide barriers between discharge cells in order to improve on the quality of the picture and to prevent electrical conduction between the individual cells.

Sreeram teaches the formation of ceramic barrier ribs on the metal substrate (column 2, lines 50-51). The barrier ribs (the second layer of the first substrate) are formed of a matrix of regularly spaced ribs (Figure 3, the regular protrusions whose height is delineated by element 318).

Therefore regarding claim 7, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Morita's first substrate being a first layer of a flat fixed area with a second layer formed of a matrix, such as of barrier ribs, to improve picture quality.

Regarding claim 8, Morita lacks disclosure of an insulating layer formed on the first surface of the first substrate.

However, it is well known in the art to provide insulating layers between the electrodes and the substrate to prevent contaminant migration or to electrically isolate the electrode.

Art Unit: 2879

Sreeram teaches a separation between the electrode (Figure 3, element 310) and the substrate (110) via an insulating layer (112) formed on the first surface of the first substrate in order to protect the electrodes (column 11, lines 39-41). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Morita's display with an insulating layer formed over the first substrate in order to protect both the substrate and the electrode.

5. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita et al. (5,831,374) in view of admitted prior art (admission) as applied to claims 1-3, 5 and 7-10 above, and further in view of Konishi et al. (5,957,743). Morita discloses a flat luminescent lamp with all the limitations discussed above, including electrodes, but lacks explicit disclosure of the material used to make the electrodes.

It is well known in the art to provide a transparent, conductive electrode such as one formed of indium tin oxide, so that the display picture is not obstructed by the electrodes formed on the display substrate.

Konishi teaches the use of a transparent, conductive material to form the display electrodes (column 1, lines 16-19). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Morita's display with transparent display (second) electrodes in order to provide a luminescent display with good picture quality.

Art Unit: 2879

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharlene Leurig whose telephone number is (703)305-4745. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on (703)305-4794. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)308-7382 for regular communications and (703)308-7382 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0956.

Sharlene Leurig
February 12, 2003

SL

